DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 053 673 HE 002 429

TITLE	A Report on the Status of Women at the University of Washington; Part II, Undergraduate and Graduate Students.
INSTITUTION	Washington Univ., Seattle.
PUB DATE	May 71
NOTE	29p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Performance, *College Students, *Discriminatory Attitudes (Social), Enrollment, *Females, Financial Support, *Graduate Students, Higher Education, *Social Discrimination
IDENTIFIERS	*Washington University (Seattle)

ABSTRACT

This report on the status of undergraduate and graduate women at the University of Washington presents information on: (1) admissions 1970, including undergraduate and graduate admissions procedures, summaries and analyses of undergraduate and graduate admissions data, admissions at the schools of dentistry, law, and medicine, and minority student enrollment and differential admission requirements; (2) women's academic performance in terms of their undergraduate grade-point average, undergraduate honors, and graduate achievements; (3) attrition, including attrition rates, the attitudes bearing on attrition, and the paucity of role models and counseling; (4) financial aids, including the distribution of grants, loans, and scholarships by sex, the number of scholarships, fellowships, and traineeships awarded for the academic year 1969-70 and the percentage received by women, women in subfaculty positions, and pay in work-study jobs; and (5) student employment and student housing. (AF)

ED053673

A REPORT
ON THE
STATUS OF WOMEN
AT THE
UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

PART II

UNDERGRADUATE AND GRADUATE STUDENTS

HE002429

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

CONTENTS

Page

I. INTRODUCTION 2

A. Purpose 2
B. Sources 2
C. Acknowledgements 2

II. ADMISSIONS 1970 7

A. Undergraduate Admissions 7
1. Admissions Procedure 7
2. Summary of Undergraduate Admissions Data 7
3. Analysis of Undergraduate Admissions Data 8
B. Graduate Admissions 8
1. Admissions Procedure 8
2. Summary of Graduate Admissions Data 9
3. Analysis of Graduate Admissions Data 9
C. Professional Schools 10
1. School of Dentistry 10
2. School of Law 11
3. School of Medicine 12
D. Minority Student Admission 13
1. Distribution of Minority Student Enrollment 13
2. Differential Admission Requirements 13

III. PERFORMANCE 15

A. Undergraduate Grade Point Average 15
B. Undergraduate Honors 15
C. Graduate School Low Scholarship 15

IV. ATTRITION 15

A. Rates 15
B. Attitudes Bearing on Attrition: Self-Fulfilling Prophesy 19
C. Role Models and Counseling 20

V. FINANCIAL AIDS 21

A. Grants, Loans, and Scholarships 21
1. Distribution of Awards 21
2. Financial Aids Policy Change 22
B. Scholarships, Fellowships, and Traineeships 22
C. Subfaculty Positions 23
D. Work Study 24
E. Student Employment 25
1. Employment Distribution 25
2. Library Page Jobs 26
3. Redress of Grievance 26
F. Student Employment Office 27
G. Student Housing 28

VI. CONCLUSION 28

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Purpose

The Associated Students of the University of Washington Women's Commission initiated research toward this report out of concern about sex discrimination at the University of Washington. Specific institutions are often microcosms of a larger order, and follow patterns of prejudice and inequality which characterize society as a whole; hence to begin at the University of Washington is a constructive measure toward altering the whole.

Our concern was further based upon the troubling recognition that the status of women in American academic institutions has actually deteriorated in the last four decades: percentages of women faculty are smaller, especially in the higher ranks; salary differentials between men and women are greater.[1] Women's groups and university committees are preparing or have prepared studies of women at the Universities of Maryland, Chicago, Oregon, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Pittsburgh, and at Harvard, Columbia, and Stanford; we wished similarly to investigate the status of women at UW in hopes of identifying problems and facilitating change. We hope also that this report will offer faculty, staff, and student women indicators that the frustrations we feel separately are caused by conditions we have in common, conditions we can unite to alter.

B. Sources

1. University Documents Consulted:
   a. University of Washington *Statistical Report 1969-70.*
   b. University of Washington *Bulletin 1970-72.*
   c. University of Washington *Admissions Statistical Reports,* anonymous computer runs of undergraduate and graduate admissions including applications, acceptances, denials, and reasons for denial broken down by school, department, and sex.
   d. *New Student Report,* Autumn 1970 (non-matriculated excluded).
   e. *Program of Exercises, Ninety-Fifth Commencement (Revised),* June 13, 1970.
   f. Anonymous computer run of faculty and subfaculty salaries as of May 29, 1970; breakdown by school, department, rank, and sex.
   g. *Graduate Study and Research Bulletin 1969.*
2. University Offices and Agencies which provided information:
   a. Office of Admissions
   b. Office of the Registrar
   c. Graduations Office
   d. Office of Institutional Educational Research
   e. Career Planning and Placement
   f. Graduate School
   g. Graduate School Admissions
   h. School of Law
   i. School of Medicine
   j. School of Dentistry
   k. Office of Minority Affairs
   l. Financial Aids
   m. Student Placement Center
   n. Personnel and Communications Services
   o. Office of Equal Opportunity for Minorities

C. Acknowledgements

We take full responsibility for interpretations of data in this report. We wish, however, to express gratitude to those persons who gave us encouragement, advice, and assistance in compiling Part II: Graduate School Admissions, Elizabeth Beach; Office of Institutional Education Research, Jim Morishima; Graduations, June Becker; University Library, Phyllis E. Hulen; Hall Health Center, Dr. Elaine Henley; Financial Aids, Donald Noble and William Baker; Office of Equal Opportunity for Minorities, Carver Gayton; Graduate School, Dr. Thelma Kennedy, Jean Hill, Nancy Marilley, Sharon Gilmore and James Linse; Print Plant, Jim Goll; Anne Schwieshow, Director, University YWCA; Julie Coryell, Instructor, Women's Studies; Barbara Garner; Judie Solie; Shelly Crites; Student Employment Office, Joe Hollinsworth; and Randy Lee.

Funding for this report was provided by the Associated Students of the University of Washington and the University of Washington Graduate and Professional Student Senate.

ASUW Women's Commission
May, 1971

[1]Dr. Edwin C. Lewis, *Developing Women's Potential* (Iowa State University, 1968). Also Richard E. Farson, "The Rage of Women," *Look* December 16, 1969, and Patricia Albjerg Graham, "Women in Academe," *Science,* Vol. 169 No. 3952 (September 25, 1970), pp. 1284-1290.

TABLE A

Numbers and percentages of women and men undergraduate students, graduate students, and degree recipients in each department for the academic year 1969-70. (Sources: *Yearly Statistical Report 1969-70, Program of Exercises, Ninety-Fifth Commencement (Revised),* **June 13, 1970, and Graduations Office.**

Department	Undergraduate Majors					Graduate Students					MA/S			Cand. Cert.			PhD		
	M	%M	W	%W	T	M	%M	W	%W	T	M	W	%W	M	W	%W	M	W	%W
ARCH/UP														[1]					
Arch & LA	507	91	49	9	556	45	92	4	8	49	15	1	6						
UP	100	82	22	18	122	102	84	19	16	121	31	5	14	4	0	0	2	0	0
	607	90	71	10	678	147	85	23	15	170	46	6	12	4	0	0	2	0	0
%		90		10			85		15				12			0			0
ARTS & SCIENCES																			
Anthro	125	44	158	56	283	65	53	57	47	122	11	9	45	9	4	30	3	1	25
Art	297	29	715	71	1,012	54	56	42	44	96	12	7	37	1	0	0			
Asian L&L	24	54	20	46	44	47	77	14	23	61	3	2	40	7	5	42	2	2	50
Astronomy						15	100	0	0	15	2	0	0	3	0	0	1	0	0
At. Sci.	48	98	1	2	49	35	92	3	8	38	8	0	0	2	2	50	3	1	25
Botany	25	52	23	48	48	26	63	15	37	41	6	2	25	5	2	29	5	0	0
Chemistry	268	84	51	16	319	152	81	36	19	188	9	4	31	19	3	14	32	2	6
Classics	10	33	20	67	30	32	65	17	35	49	4	5	56				3	0	0
Comm.	298	58	220	42	518	21	62	13	38	34	8	6	43	1	0	0			
Drama	91	35	167	65	258	39	63	23	37	62	19	8	30	4	1	20	1	0	0
Economics	263	89	32	11	295	82	87	12	13	94	9	0	0	6	1	14	10	0	0
Eng. & CL	409	39	649	61	1,058	218	53	194	47	412	25	28	53	32	8	20	11	5	32
FER	86	59	60	41	146	3	60	2	40	5	5	0	0						
Genetics	0	0	1	100	1	25	76	8	24	33	1	2	67	6	1	14	4	0	0
Geography	78	73	29	27	107	72	87	11	13	83	6	2	25	14	0	0	10	0	0
Geo. Sci.	57	88	8	12	65	61	92	6	8	67	7	3	30	5	0	0	8	0	0
Geophysics						29	97	1	3	30	+[2]	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Germ L&L	34	36	61	64	95	35	39	54	61	89	8	14	64	2	4	67	2	4	67
History	351	58	256	42	607	158	73	57	27	215	19	11	37	27	3	10	11	0	0
Home Ec.	1	1	329	99	330	0	0	53	100	53	0	7	100						
Ling.						25	73	15	27	40	1	1	50	1	0	0			
Math.	369	70	158	30	527	160	81	37	19	197	23	8	26	15	0	0	13	0	0
Music	93	46	111	54	204	78	59	55	41	133	5	3	38	9	2	18	5	1	16
NE	6	40	9	60	15	8	57	6	43	14	0	1	100						
Ocean	521	88	73	12	594	95	86	15	14	110	19	4	17	11	1	8	3	0	0
Phil.	104	76	32	24	136	66	86	11	14	77	10	2	17	3	0	0	4	0	0
PE–Men	40	100	0	0	40	18	100	0	0	18	37	0	0						
PE–Women	1	2	75	98	75	0	0	34	100	34	0	19	100						
Physics	208	94	12	6	220	162	97	5	3	167	24	2	8	23	2	8	18	0	0
Poli-Sci.	494	78	137	22	631	114	83	23	17	137	18	8	31	27	4	13	5	2	28
Psych	257	56	203	44	460	75	62	46	38	121	3	1	25	4	6	60	18	2	10
Asian Studies						18	78	5	22	23	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Romance L&L	52	16	273	84	325	45	33	91	67	136	7	26	79	4	4	50	1	3	75
Scand L&L	5	24	16	76	21	9	47	10	53	19	2	2	50	1	0	0			
Slavic L&L	31	42	42	58	73	21	45	26	55	47	4	4	50	0	2	100			
Sociology	222	37	382	63	604	82	70	36	30	118	12	9	43	2	0	0	7	1	13
Speech	22	27	61	73	83	60	45	73	55	133	15	25	63	10	5	33	4	0	0
Zoology	280	71	119	29	399	46	67	23	33	69	5	6	54	7	1	13	9	2	18
	5,170	53	4,503	47	9,673	2,233	67	1,124	33	3,357	349	231	40	260	61	19	193	26	12
%		53		47			67		33				40			19			12

Department	Undergraduate Majors					Graduate Students					MA/S			Cand. Cert.			PhD		
	M	%M	W	%W	T	M	%M	W	%W	T	M	W	%W	M	W	%W	M	W	%W
BUS. AD.	1,435	93	113	7	1,548	519	98	13	2	532	147	4	3	14	0	0	10	0	0
EDUCATION	974	22	3,386	78	4,360	413	50	419	50	832	89	140	62	33	8	20	21	4	16
ENGINEERING																			
A&A	276	99	4	1	280	135	98	2	2	137									
Chem E	156	98	3	2	159	54	98	1	2	55									
Civl E	321	99	1	1	322	219	99	2	1	221									
Elec E	640	98	11	2	651	222	99	1	1	223				no separate figures available					
Mech E	482	99	3	1	485	157	94	1	6	158									
M,M,&C	105	95	5	5	110	68	100	0	0	68									
Nuc E	166	92	14	8	180	49	100	0	0	49									
Gen E	525	97	14	3	539	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----									
	2,671	98	55	2	2,726	904	92	7	8	911	153	2	1	49	0	0	41	0	0
%		98		2			92		8				1			0			0
FISHERIES	174	92	16	8	190	115	91	12	9	127	18	2	10	10	0	0	9	0	0
FOR. RES.	254*	93	20	7	274	127	92	11	8	138	13	4	24	20	0	0	5	0	0
LIBRARIANSHIP	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	33	13	224	87	257	42	140	77	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
PUBLIC AFF.	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	81	79	21	21	102	22	8	28	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
LAW (GRAD)	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	5	100	0	0	5	4	0	0	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
HEALTH SCIENCES																			
Nursing	10	1	837	99	847	4	2	198	98	202	0	87	100	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Pharm Sci	190*	59	130	41	320	22	65	12	35	34	0	2	100	3	0	0	2	0	0
Social Work	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	134	39	206	61	340	52	86	63	+	+	+	+	+	+
Biomath	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	25	78	7	22	32	1	0	0	1	1	50	+	+	+
Med Stds.	13	12	99	88	112														
Comp Phys	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	3	100	0	0	3	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	1	1	50
Phys-Psych	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	8	57	6	43	14	1	1	50	-----	-----	-----	2	1	33
Rad Sci	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	7	78	2	22	9	4	0	0	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Biochem	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	36	69	16	31	52	2	1	33	6	1	14	3	1	25
Bio Str	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	10	67	5	33	15	2	0	0	0	3	100	-----	-----	-----
Microbio	47	47	53	53	100	22	73	8	27	30	1	0	0	4	1	20	4	1	20
Path	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	14	87	2	13	16	2	0	0	5	0	0	2	0	0
Pharm	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	14	100	0	0	14	3	1	25	7	0	0	2	0	0
Phys Med	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	20	74	7	26	27	2	0	0	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Phys-Bio	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	35	80	9	20	44	-----	-----	-----	5	0	0	2	1	33
Prev Med	25	86	4	14	29	15	83	3	17	18	1	3	75	1	0	0	-----	-----	-----
Dent. (grad)	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	67	94	4	6	71	18	0	0	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
	285	20	1,123	80	1,408	436	47	485	53	921	89	181	67	32	6	16	18	5	22
%		20		80			47		53				67			16			22
COMP. SCI.	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	33	79	9	21	42	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
MEDICINE	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	332	94	21	6	353	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	76	7	8
LAW	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	341	91	34	9	375	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	97	4	4
DENTISTRY	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	314	100	0	0	314	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	78	0	0
TOTAL	11,570		9,287		20,857	6,051	72	2,408	28	8,459	970**	718	43	422	75	15	550	46	8
											(958)	(685)	42				(555)	(44)	7

[1]None awarded.

[2]Information not available.

*Not in *Yearly Statistical Report* 1969-70; figures from *Autumn 1970 Statistical Report*.

**The totals for Masters' and Doctors' degrees do not agree with totals for 1969-70 supplied by the Graduations Office (as reported in their annual document to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare). Since the latter figures were not broken down by school and department, specific adjustments could not be made—they are here presented in parentheses.

TABLE B

Numbers and percentages of women and men undergraduate students, graduate students, and degree recipients in each department of the College of Arts and Sciences for the academic year 1969-70. (Men's and Women's Physical Education omitted. Sources: *Yearly Statistical Report 1969-70, Program of Exercises, Ninety-Fifth Commencement (Revised), June 13, 1970.)*

Department	Undergraduate Majors			Graduate Students			MA/S		Cand. Cert.		PhD	
	M	W	T	M	W	T	M	W	M	W	M	W
SOCIAL SCIENCES*												
Anthropology	125	158	283	65	57	122	11	9	9	4	3	1
Communications	298	220	518	21	13	34	8	6	1	0	-------	------
Economics	263	32	295	82	12	94	9	0	6	1	10	0
Far Eastern/Russian	86	60	146	3	2	5	5	0	-------	-------	------	-------
History	351	256	607	158	57	215	19	11	27	3	11	0
Geography	78	29	107	72	11	83	6	2	14	0	10	0
Linguistics	-------	-------	-------	25	15	40	1	1	1	0	-------	-------
Philosophy	104	32	136	66	11	77	10	2	3	0	4	0
Political Science	494	137	631	114	23	137	18	8	27	4	5	2
Psychology	257	203	460	75	46	121	3	1	4	6	18	2
Sociology	222	382	604	82	36	118	12	9	2	0	7	1
	2,278	1,509	3,787	763	283	1,046	102	49	94	18	68	6
%	60	40		73	27		67	33	84	16	82	18
HUMANITIES												
Art	297	715	1,012	54	42	96	12	7	1	0	-------	-------
Asian	24	20	44	47	14	61	3	2	7	5	2	2
Classics	10	20	30	32	17	49	4	5	-------	-------	3	0
Drama	91	167	258	39	23	62	19	8	4	1	1	0
English	409	649	1,058	218	194	412	25	28	32	8	11	5
Germanic L&L	34	61	95	35	54	89	8	14	2	4	2	4
Home Economics	1	329	330	0	53	53	0	7	-------	-------	-------	-------
Near Eastern	6	9	15	8	6	14	0	1	-------	-------	-------	-------
Music	93	111	204	78	55	133	5	3	9	2	5	1
Romance L&L	52	273	325	45	91	136	7	26	4	4	1	3
Scandinavian L&L	5	16	21	9	10	19	2	2	1	0	-------	-------
Slavic L&L	31	42	73	21	26	47	4	4	0	2	-------	-------
Speech	22	61	83	60	73	133	15	25	10	5	4	0
	1,075	2,473	3,548	646	658	1,304	104	124	70	31	29	15
%	52	48		50	50		46	54	69	31	66	34
NATURAL SCIENCES												
Astronomy	-------	-------	-------	15	0	15	2	0	3	0	1	0
Atmospheric Sci.	48	1	49	35	3	38	8	0	2	2	3	1
Botany	25	23	48	26	15	41	6	2	5	2	5	0
Chemistry	268	51	319	152	36	188	9	4	19	3	32	2
Genetics	0	1	1	25	8	33	1	2	6	1	4	0
Geological Sci.	57	8	65	61	6	67	7	3	5	0	8	0
Geophysics	-------	-------	-------	29	1	30	+	+	+	+	+	+
Mathematics	369	158	527	160	37	197	23	8	15	0	13	0
Oceanography	521	73	594	95	15	110	19	4	11	1	3	0

Department	Undergraduate Majors			Graduate Students			MA/S		Cand. Cert.		PhD	
	M	W	T	M	W	T	M	W	M	W	M	W
Physics	208	12	220	162	5	167	24	2	23	8	18	0
Zoology	280	119	399	46	23	69	5	6	7	1	9	2
	1,776	446	2,222	806	149	955	104	31	96	18	96	5
%	80	20		84	16		77	23	84	16	95	5

Percent of Total Women in the College of Arts and Sciences

Social Sciences	40	32	24	27	
Humanities	37	39	61	46	
Natural Sciences	23	29	15	27	
	100	100	100	100	

*Where assignment to "Social Science," "Humanities," and "Natural Science" categories was unclear, individual departments were called.

II. ADMISSIONS 1970

A. Undergraduate Admissions

1. Admissions Procedure

The admissions procedure described here was instituted in Fall 1969 at the time the University established an enrollment limitation to reduce the growth of the University. This procedure was in operation for the Fall 1970 admissions, which are described in the next part of this report (2. Summary of Undergraduate Admissions).

Freshman Admissions. The University required a high school GPA of 2.50 for Washington residents and the children of UW alumni; out-of-state applicants were required to have at least a 3.20 to be eligible for admission. Assuming that these minimum scholastic requirements were met, applicants were not given any special preference for higher grade point averages. Among those eligible applicants admission was based solely on date of application, on a first-come-first-served basis.

Transfer Admissions. The minimum GPA for transfer students was 2.00; 3.00 for out-of-state applicants. (A higher GPA was sometimes required for students with a deficiency in some subject.) Among those who met the academic requirement, preference was given students who had completed a substantial number of credits beyond the minimum number set by the college to which they were applying.

Admission by Petition. Applicants who did not meet the GPA requirements could petition for special consideration by the Admissions Committee.

Exceptions to the above. A few special categories of people were considered separately: those eligible for EOP (Educational Opportunities Program), applicants for athletic scholarships, foreign students, and applicants to a few departments with special requirements. Some of these categories emanate from programs which had a certain number of admissions allotted to them for Fall 1970. These programs include:

EOP	600
Honors Program	180
Education (4 special programs)	37
Critical Language Program	5
Study Abroad Program	50
Intercollegiate Athletics	160
Drama	14
Upward Bound	19
TOTAL:	1,065 student spaces allotted

2. Summary of Undergraduate Admissions Data

There are four possible outcomes to an application for admission to the University: (1) acceptance, (2) denial on the basis of the applicant's GPA (scholastic denial), (3) denial of applicants who met the academic requirement but applied after the publicized application deadline *and* after the enrollment limit had been reached[2] (space denial), and (4) applications which were not completed and therefore not acted upon.

For Fall 1970, 12,526 applications were received. Of these 80.3% were accepted, 18.5% were rejected because academic standards weren't met, 0.2% were denied admission because of space limitation, and 1.0% were not completed.[3] Table 1 shows the application action by sex of applicant for all undergraduate applications (both high school and transfer).

TABLE 1

Admission Action	Male No.	%	Female No.	%	Total	% Female of Total
Accept	5,417	76	4,649	86	10,066	46
Scholastic Denial	1,619	23	705	13	2,324	30
Space Denial	5	----	3	----	8	38
Incomplete	91	1	37	1	128	29
TOTAL	7,132		5,394		12,526	43

[2]It was necessary to deny admission to almost no students. Despite the existence of the enrollment limitation, there were only 8 space denials out of some 12,000 applications.

[3]All data for this and for the section on Graduate Admissions were compiled from examination of an anonymous computer run, *Admissions Statistical Reports*, provided by the Registrar's Office.

The last column of the Table presents the proportion of women in each of the admission categories. Thus, while women represent 43% of all applicants, they make up 46% of all acceptances, 30% of all scholastic denials, and 38% of the few space denials, 29% of the incomplete applications. These findings suggest that while women are less likely to apply for admission to the University of Washington than men, having applied they are more likely to meet the academic requirements of the University than are male applicants (86% females accepted vs. 76% males). They are also more likely to complete an application than are male applicants. This summary table does not suggest the existence of sex discrimination in the admissions procedure once an applicant initiates that procedure by filing an application.

When applications are broken down into two categories—high school applicants and transfer applicants—the findings are similar. Women represent 44.7% of the 7,713 applications from high school and 44.7% of the total number of high school applications which are accepted for admission. Again, they are slightly less likely to apply for admission but having applied are more likely to meet the academic requirements for acceptance (79.7% of male applicants were accepted, 88.5% of the female applicants were accepted.)

Of the 4,813 applications for admission from transfer students, 40% were from females. Women, however, made up 44% of those 3,613 applications which were acceptable by the academic standards. Among transfer applications, women applied again less frequently than men, but among those applications received, a larger proportion of those from women were accepted (82% vs. 70%).

3. Analysis of Undergraduate Admissions Data

Channeling. The above findings indicate that there is no evidence of any sex discrimination in the admissions process. However, they do suggest the existence of channeling during the educational experience prior to application for admission to the University of Washington. The lower proportion of female applicants suggests that women are discouraged from aspiring to higher education at the University level. Given the greater likelihood of those women who apply to have met the academic standards for admission, it is possible that qualified or perhaps some marginally-qualified women are refraining from making application or are not encouraged to make application in the numbers that marginally-qualified men do.

The existence of channeling becomes even more obvious when the proportions applying for admission are examined by college. In our society, women are typically channeled into professions that are extensions of the home-role (home economics, nursing, teaching, social service) and channeled away from fields which are scientific, technical, or involve out-of-door work. Of the eleven colleges to which undergraduates applied in Fall 1970,[4] women represented 6% of the applications to Architecture and Urban Planning, 4% of the applications to Business Administration, 2% of the applications to Engineering, 2% of the applications to Fisheries, and 9% of the applications to Forest Resources. On the other hand, 98% of the College of Nursing applicants were women. This is clear evidence for the existence of widespread sex-channeling and suggests the need for anti-channeling programs in the high schools. Such anti-channeling efforts by the University, which emphasized both encouragement of women to apply for admission as well as recruitment of high school women into "male" fields, would represent a sincere attempt at affirmative action by the University to counter sex discrimination both in the University community and in the larger society.

Athletic Scholarships. Ten percent of the undergraduates admitted to the University in Fall 1970 were admitted through one of the eight special programs listed on page 2. Students admitted through these programs were frequently recruited by the University and were exempt from application deadlines and not subject to the minimum scholastic requirement. Fifteen percent of these positions in the special programs were allotted to Intercollegiate Athletics. This is the only special program which is limited to members of one sex only, and it involves 160 spaces—1.6% of the applications which were accepted. Although in relative terms 160 is not a large number, the existence of this program for male applicants only is an indicator of the continued lack of complete universalism in the University's attitude toward those seeking admission.

B. Graduate Admissions

1. Admissions Procedure

All applications to the Graduate School are forwarded to the appropriate academic department for evaluation. It is these academic departments which recommend to the Graduate School admission action on each application. Although there is a general requirement for admission to graduate studies at the University of B (3.00) level performance or better during the last two years of undergraduate work, through 1970-71 when departments wished to admit applicants who did not meet this scholastic requirement, they could petition the Graduate School for waiver of the GPA requirement. This petition process had to be initiated by the department and could not be initiated by the applicants themselves. It is reported that the Graduate School granted virtually all petitions.[5] Thus, the departments were constrained in their admission decisions only by the quotas limiting the number of applicants they could admit.

[4]The eleven colleges are Architecture and Urban Planning, Arts and Sciences, Business Administration, Dentistry, Education, Engineering, Fisheries, Forest Resources, Medicine, Nursing, and Pharmacy.

[5]The Graduate School has discontinued this petition procedure for Fall 1971 admissions.

It should be noted that many departments assign the responsibility for evaluating applications to a committee of the faculty, whose composition changes yearly.

2. **Summary of Graduate Admissions Data**

While the two general outcomes of an application for graduate admission at the University of Washington are simply acceptance and denial, the Graduate School has provided data which break down the reason for denial into several categories, each coded for computer processing. The denial categories are: insufficient preparation, limited facilities, scholastic deficiency, limited staff, limited classroom space, insufficient curriculum, space denial, "other," no reason given, and "no code." Space denials are denials of applications which were otherwise qualified for acceptance but which arrived after the department quota was filled. As in the case of undergraduate applications, space denials were rare.

Of the 9,588 applications to graduate study at the UW, 44% were accepted. These applications were dispersed over eleven colleges and 72 departments. Analysis included examination of the sex distribution of action on all applications for each of these colleges and departments, controlling for denial code. Space and budget do not permit the publication of tables in this report; they are on file in the Women's Commission Office and are available for examination.

3. **Analysis of Graduate Admissions Data**

In the case of the graduate admissions procedure, it is difficult to demonstrate either the presence or absence of sex discrimination. Because the locus of admission decision is the individual department, it is of no utility to examine the totals for all applications for evidence of the presence or absence of bias. Since the total number of applications received were dispersed over 89 admission granting units (colleges or departments), acts of discrimination could occur and never be apparent at the aggregate level.

On the other hand, examination of the data for individual departments is hampered by the fact that the number of applications for many departments is often so small that percentages computed on the proportion (by sex) of those applicants admitted or denied do not make reliable comparisons possible. Moreover, with results from a large number of colleges and departments, there is to be expected (and there exists) wide variation in the proportion of female applicants who have been accepted. Thus, some departments have accepted greater proportions of women than men, and some have accepted more of the men who applied than the women. In interpreting these results it is therefore impossible to differentiate whether the cause of a low proportion of women accepted is simply random variation or is systematic discrimination.

One thing which is clear upon examining these data by sex and departmental action is that departments have a great deal of latitude in "explaining" their action on applications, given the eight-denial code system. Codes such as "limited facilities," "no reason given" and "other" are sufficiently vague that they can be used in instances where the denial reason is difficult to code–one such instance being the conscious or unconscious desire on the part of a department to keep down the number of women graduate students. While the code "no reason given" was rarely used, the codes "limited facilities" and "other" were often used; in some departments 80-100% of the students denied admission were coded one of these two categories. Moreover, there are departments where these particular codes are much more likely to be used to account for the denials of one sex than the other.

Channeling. The data for graduate school admissions provide strong evidence of the existence of sex-channeling in secondary and undergraduate education. For example, only 9 of 490 applications to the College of Engineering were from women; of those 9, 8 were accepted. Technical and science departments do not need to practice discrimination, if they are so inclined; sex channeling does the job so efficiently almost no women apply. Table 2 suggests the effectiveness of channeling in many of the physical science and rigorous social science disciplines. The departments listed are all in the College of Arts and Sciences.

TABLE 2

Department	Male Applicants	Female Applicants
Astronomy	37	5
Atmos. Science	29	6
Chemistry	65	13
Economics	179	19
Geography	89	14
Geo. Science	118	16
Mathematics	220	47
Oceanography	237	28
Physics	160	14
Political Science	214	38

Affirmative Action. Affirmative action involves more than the cessation of discrimination; it involves an affirmative program to promote equality of opportunity for groups which have been subject to discrimination in the past. The University has a unique opportunity to engage in affirmative action in respect to sex. Because of its educative function and because of its interdependence on other educational institutions in the state—particularly secondary schools—the University can both seek out and encourage women to enter scientific and technical fields, and also serve as an example to secondary and undergraduate educators as well. The only realistic response to the examples of channeling we encounter in this report is such affirmative action.

Affirmative action, however, need not be limited to recruitment. Qualified women applicants are being turned down by graduate departments in this University as a result of insufficient classroom space, academic staff, general facilities, and departmental quotas on size of graduate program. These women are being turned down in departments where women make up less than 50% of the graduate enrollment. Affirmative action at the Graduate School or departmental level can be taken by striving for sex balance, and not turning down *qualified* women until that balance is reached. Chemical engineering, for example, turned down the single female applicant to that department for "lack of space," admitting 43 of the men who applied. If there is space for 43 men, there is space for one woman. Biochemistry accepted two of the ten women who applied for admission, while accepting nine men. Of those eight women denied admission, seven were denied for "limited facilities." Examples like these are easy to find. There may be explanations for the action of individual departments, but the pattern across departments is clear: male-channeled fields frequently don't seem to have room for all of the relatively few qualified women who apply. This is clearly an area which is in need of affirmative action.

C. Professional Schools: Admission[6]

1. School of Dentistry

Since the first entering class in 1946, the School of Dentistry has graduated one woman. The virtual nonexistence of women in the School in the last 24 years has fostered the belief that women are systematically excluded from that division of the University as a matter of policy. The School of Dentistry denies this, and explains that for the most part no qualified women apply. The following data were requested from its Committee on Admissions, to clarify admission procedures as regards the entering classes of 1969 and 1970:

TABLE 3

Class	Applicants			Accepted			% of class W	% of school W
	M	W	T	M	W	T		
1969	530	4	534	78	2	80	0	0
1970	463	1	464	83	0	83	0	0

Of the four female applicants in 1969, 2 were accepted and did not choose the University of Washington, 1 was rejected because of grades, and one did not complete her application. The one woman who was denied admission had qualifications which compared with those of men accepted as follows:

TABLE 4

		Predental GPA		Overall GPA	Dental Admission Test (scored 1 to 9)
men	Lowest	1.78	1.99	A3 M3	(A=academic
	Highest	4.00	3.95	A7 M8	M=manual dexterity)
	Average	2.88	2.90	A5 M5	
	woman	2.17	2.90	A5 M5	

[6]Admissions information about the professional schools was difficult to obtain; the data and conclusions published here may properly be suggestions towards further research by women's caucases within the separate schools.

It is clear that the woman denied admission in 1969 had academic qualifications above those of the lowest man accepted. The Dental School records that her quarter credit was 138 units while the average accepted man's quarter credit was 187; since the School did not indicate what the credits earned by the lowest man accepted were, no conclusions can be drawn from the figure.

According to an official on the Committee on Admissions, the lone woman who applied in 1970 was denied admission because she was from California. He further explained that "We haven't accepted anyone from California in 56 years." Washington State residents have first priority in admissions (80%), then applicants from surrounding states without dental schools, and finally applicants from Oregon and California.

The rejected woman's credentials compared with accepted men's as follows:

TABLE 5

		Predental GPA	Overall GPA	Dental Admission Test (scored 1 to 9)
	Lowest	1.83	2.13	A3 M3 (A=academic
men	Highest	3.91	3.84	A8 M7 M=manual dexterity)
	Average	2.87	2.93	A5 M5
	woman	2.52	2.61	A3 M5

Again the woman's qualifications are clearly above those of the lowest man accepted. If the Dental School is sincerely interested in educating women, it would seem that a residence handicap could be lifted as part of an affirmative action policy.

The School of Dentistry has earned the reputation among women of being discriminatory, and the information recorded above does not dispel doubt. Women interested in dentistry have in the past decided not to apply to the University of Washington because of its negative reputation, and unless the School takes strong and obvious steps toward providing examples of equal opportunity, women will continue to believe they are not welcome.

2. **School of Law**

The School of Law provided the following information about its admissions for the academic years 1969-70 and 1970-71:

TABLE 6

Class	Applicants		Accepted		Inc.		Wait. List		% of app. acc.		% of acc. W
	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W	
1969	785	56	278	30	97	7	34	1	35	54	10
1970	942	84	259	26	32	5	20	2	27	31	10

It appears that women are less likely to apply to the School of Law, but once they have applied they are more likely than men to meet the entrance requirements. According to the Office of the Dean of the Law School, "The Admissions Council, as stated in its 'Guide for Applicants,' 'gave no preference to, but did not discriminate against, women in making its determination.' Thus the women applicants, like the men applicants, who did not meet the Admissions Council's qualifications were denied admission."

Of all the numbers printed above, those in the last column deserve closest attention: where proportions of women in a school remain the same year to year (especially considering the wide fluctuation in column 6 of Table 6) there is some reason to suspect a quota system. This indicator has led to exposure of quotas in other universities; further inquiry into admissions for years preceding 1969 would be necessary to determine whether such a policy exists at the University of Washington School of Law.

The Law School also supplied comparative data on men's and women's qualifications, both for those accepted and those denied admission. In considering an applicant, the LSAT (Law School Aptitude Test) score and the cumulative GPA for the last two years of undergraduate work are weighted equally, and a combination of the two yields a number used in determining admission.

TABLE 7

		GPA		LSAT	
		Median	Range	Median	Range
Entering Class:	'69				
Accepted:	M	3.19	4.00-1.77	617	791-355
	W	3.47	3.90-2.00	588	756-318
Denied:	M	2.77	3.86-1.22	532	767-239
	W	2.87	3.36-2.05	476	594-358
Entering Class:	'70				
Accepted:	M	3.37	4.00-2.07	637	800-346
	W	3.43	3.88-2.31	614	745-333
Denied:	M	2.88	3.79-1.81	541	759-221
	W	3.08	3.98-2.01	544	632-243

According to the Law School, in the last five years women have applied with higher GPAs than men applicants; men have had higher LSAT scores than women in that same period. Only a comparison of the numbers derived for individuals from the combination of their scores would clearly establish the presence of discrimination.

3. **School of Medicine**

Information supplied by the School of Medicine provides the following patterns for admission in 1969 and 1970:

TABLE 8

Class	Applicants		Accepted		% of app. acc.		% of Class W	% of acc.	% of sch.
	M	W	M	W	M	W			
1969	616	37	81	3	13	8	4	3	6
1970	709	95	89	15*	13	16	12	14	7

*2 were accepted and did not choose the University of Washington.

Distribution of women in classes: 1970

	1st year			2nd year			3rd year			4th year		
	M	W	%W	M	W	%W	M	W	%W	M	W	%W
'69-70	81	3	4	79	5	6	78	8	9	89	5	5
'70-71	89	13	12	80	4	5	101**	5	5	90**	8	8

**Increase in numbers due to transfers

Distribution of students in entering class '70 by sex and GPA:

	W	% of W		M	% of M		
3.75-4.00				17	19		
3.50-3.74	9	69		33	26		
3.25-3.49	3	23	100%	29	33	87%	Minimum
3.00-3.24	1	8		8	9		GPA
2.75-2.99				5	6		Requirement
2.50-2.74				3	3		3.0
2.25-2.49				1	1	13%	
2.00-2.24				2	2		
1.75-1.99				1	1		
	13			89			

The School of Medicine admitted 12 more women in 1970 than in 1969, or an increase in that time of 400%. This number represents a substantial increase in the yearly proportion of women since the school's first entering class in 1950. This may be due to an increase in the number of qualified women applying for study in medicine, or it may be the result of a relaxation of previous quotas against women. In either case, it is clear that the Medical School adhered strictly to its requirement of a 3.0 GPA in the admission of women, while relaxing that minimum standard for 13% of the men accepted. A larger number of women could study medicine at the University if the apparent special privileges were extended equally.

D. Minority Student Admission

1. Distribution of Minority Student Enrollment

A study was conducted to ascertain the degree to which minority students are represented on the University of Washington Campus. Table 9 represents a breakdown of the population by race and/or national group in both the state of Washington and King County, and Table 10 indicates numbers and percentages of minority students at all levels of study in the University. It should be noted that in other sections of this Report, no distinction is made between minority and non-minority students. Thus where contrasts exist, or comparisons are made, the distinguishing factor is sex alone.[7]

As can be seen in Table 10, the highest percentage of undergraduate minority students is to be found at the freshman level. The percentage of representation drops off as the levels advance, however, and at the graduate level the percentage of minority student representation is barely half the percentage of minority representation in the State, and considerably less than half that of King County (See Table 9). There are several ways in which this occurrence might be explained. On the undergraduate level, normal attrition could account for some of the decrease in representation, although it is possible that transfers from two-year and four-year institutions could balance out attrition. Another explanation might be that since the Office of Minority Affairs (whose task it is to recruit minority students) has only been in operation for a short time, the efforts of that office are noticeable only at the freshman and sophomore levels. On the graduate level, it may be that the Graduate School and the several graduate departments have not put sufficient effort into the recruitment, active encouragement, and retention of minority students or that the curriculum and methods are hostile to the aspirations and unique cultural attitudes of minorities. Whatever the explanation, the fact remains that at the graduate level, minority students are severely under-represented—a situation which is not in keeping with the University's commitment to affirmative action, and one for which immediate remedy is necessary.

The area of study which has the highest percentage of minority representation (7.09%) is that of the professional schools. Yet of the total enrollment (1,040) only 0.48% are minority women, meaning that of the 7.09% minority enrollment, 6.61% are male. As indicated in Subsection C above, where the general pattern of admission of women to professional schools is discussed, there is a tremendous need for the recruitment of women into these areas. In view of the findings indicated by Table 10, it would seem that particular emphasis should be placed upon the recruitment of minority women.

2. Differential Admission Requirements

Subsection C above also discusses the fact that women who are admitted to the professional schools have on the average a higher GPA than men, and that in some cases, women are denied admittance who have a higher GPA than some of the men who are accepted. While this does not in itself prove that a quota on female enrollment is in operation, it is very similar to a situation which, until recently, existed within the Educational Opportunities Program (EOP), where a quota system did in fact exist. In that program, admission requirements were categorized into three groups, each group having a different GPA assignment and each taking into consideration special educational deficiencies or proficiencies. Within two of the three groups, however, (groups 2 and 3) the GPA cutoff for women was 2.20 while the GPA cutoff for men was 2.00.

When this situation was questioned in August of 1970, the Vice President for Minority Affairs requested of the Dean of Arts and Sciences that the requirements be made the same for both men and women. The Dean of Arts and Sciences was reluctant to make the change, stating that the differential requirements in the EOP groups was necessary in order that the enrollment in that area (which has predominantly minority student enrollment)[8] should be the same as the enrollment pattern in the total University, vis a vis female/male distribution. In effect, then, it was necessary to restrict the enrollment of minority women in EOP so that their relative representation remained in keeping with the existing patterns of predominantly non-minority female enrollment in the total University.

Through continued effort on the part of the Vice President for Minority Affairs and other interested groups, the situation was finally corrected in March, 1971. This change is viewed by the Acting Dean of Arts and Sciences as only tentative or temporary in nature, however, and unless he comes to understand that such discrimination is not only

[7]Data obtained from sources other than the Office of Minority Affairs and the Office of Equal Opportunity for Minorities made no distinction on the basis of race. Such data includes regular University Publications, all computer runs, and all Student Employment and Financial Aid information.

[8]It should be noted that not all minority students are enrolled in the University through the Educational Opportunities Program and that not all students enrolled through EOP are minority students.

unbecoming to an institution of higher learning, but is also illegal, he may require that the differential requirements be reestablished after the 1972-73 academic year.

TABLE 9

	STATE OF WASHINGTON		KING COUNTY	
	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total
Total Population	3,409,169	100	1,156,633	100
All Minorities[1]	218,045	6.40	81,898	7.08
Anglo	3,191,124	93.60	1,074,735	92.92
Chicana/Chicano	59,931	1.75	9,230	0.80
Black	71,308	2.09	40,597	3.50
Oriental[2]	44,060	1.29		
Indian	33,060	0.97	7,391	0.64
Others[3]	9,360	0.27	24,680[4]	2.14

[1]Figures in this table obtained from the University of Washington Office of Equal Opportunity for Minorities.
[2]Includes Japanese and Chinese only.
[3]Includes Filipino, Hawaiian and Korean.
[4]Includes Japanese, Chinese, Filipino, Hawaiian and Korean.

TABLE 10[1]

	FRESHMAN				SOPHOMORE				JUNIOR			
	Women	Men	Total No.	% of Total	Women	Men	Total No.	% of Total	Women	Men	Total No.	% of Total
Total Univ. Population	3,475	3,767	7,242	100	3,031	3,936	6,967	100	2,669	3,946	6,615	100
All Minorities	336	466	802	11.05	238	248	486	6.94	177	239	416	6.09
Anglo	3,139	3,301	6,440	88.95	2,793	3,688	6,481	93.06	2,492	3,707	6,199	93.91
Chicana/Chicano	33	72	105	1.45	10	30	40	0.57	16	26	42	0.63
Black	135	186	321	4.43	82	92	174	2.49	44	81	125	1.88
Oriental	148	176	324	4.47	131	105	236	3.38	95	116	211	3.01
Indian	20	32	52	0.70	15	21	36	0.50	22	16	38	0.57

	SENIOR				UNCL. 5				NON. MATRIC.			
	Women	Men	Total No.	% of Total	Women	Men	Total No.	% of Total	Women	Men	Total No.	% of Total
Total Univ. Population	2,297	3,697	5,994	100	1,196	822	2,018	100	267	292	559	100
All Minorities	132	238	370	6.40	26	19	45	2.21	6	10	16	2.84
Anglo	2,165	3,459	5,624	93.60	1,170	803	1,973	97.79	261	282	543	97.16
Chicana/Chicano	7	13	20	0.57	1	1	2	0.09	1	1	2	0.35
Black	20	52	72	1.20	11	4	15	0.74	3	4	7	1.25
Oriental	93	146	239	3.98	13	14	27	1.33	2	1	3	0.53
Indian	12	27	39	0.65	1	0	1	0.05	0	4	4	0.71

	GRADUATE				PROFESSIONAL				TOTAL UNIV. POPULATION	
	Women	Men	Total No.	% of Total	Women	Men	Total No.	% of Total	Number	% of Total Number
Total Univ. Population	2,364	5,092	7,456	100	54	986	1,040	100	37,891	100
All Minorities	86	189	275	3.67	5	69	74	7.09	2,484	6.54
Anglo	2,278	4,903	7,181	96.33	49	917	966	92.91	35,409	93.46
Chicana/Chicano	2	19	21	0.28	0	4	4	0.38	236	0.62
Black	40	72	112	1.50	0	29	29	2.78	855	2.25
Oriental	38	82	120	1.60	5	22	27	2.59	1,187	3.13
Indian	6	16	22	0.29	0	14	14	1.34	206	0.54

[1]Total registration figures taken from University of Washington Yearly Statistical Report 1969-70; Minority Student registration figures taken from Autumn 1970 census cards as prepared by the Office of Minority Affairs.

III. PERFORMANCE

A. Undergraduate Grade Point Average

In every entering category, women enter the University of Washington with a higher GPA than do men. Whether they enter directly from high school or transfer from another college or junior college, whether they enter as freshmen or as upperclassmen, women have higher GPA qualifications. (See Table 11.)

According to data so far available, women as a group also graduate with a higher GPA than that of men students as a group. The UW Office of Institutional Educational Research reports that the mean graduating GPA for the class of 1965 (the most recent class for which they have formally summarized data) was 2.8 for women, 2.7 for men; predicted findings for 1970 are 3.0 for women, 2.9 for men. In addition, the Office found that in every entering GPA category, 2-3% fewer women than men are required to leave the University because of academic failure.

It is recognized that GPA is not the sole indicator of academic ability; however, the continued performance of women on this measurable scale indicates that other areas should be considered fully before individuals and departments continue to make generalizations about women's ability or inability to excel or to compete equally with men. It is not probable that women students will be found consistently higher in GPA and consistently lower in all other areas. A common criticism-defense, "Women make higher grades because they're grinds, not because they're original thinkers" would probably not be made against men, were the findings reversed.

B. Undergraduate Honors

In light of the above data, it is not surprising to find that women students earn undergraduate honors in a higher proportion to their numbers than do their male counterparts. (See Table 12.)

C. Graduate School Low Scholarship

There is no body of similar data to assess women's performance in the Graduate School, but an examination of the Low Scholarship Lists provides an interesting pattern: whether or not women excel in equal numbers with men, as they do in undergraduate studies, fewer graduate women than men do poorly. In 1969-70, women constituted 32% of the graduate students at UW; but they received only 20% of the Low Scholarship Notices (GPA below 3.0) and were only 22% of the students involved in low scholarship action (warning, probation, final probation, and drop). (See Table 13.)

IV. ATTRITION

A. Rates

According to the Office of Institutional Educational Research, attrition rates for women undergraduates are similar to those for undergraduate men, information which contradicts the accepted myth that women students drop out of college in substantially larger proportions than do their male counterparts. In addition, men take one quarter longer on the average to complete the B.A. than do women.

Data collected on the classes entering Fall 1960 and Fall 1961 indicate that after four years a lower percentage of men than women have graduated, with an average difference of 6%; after five years the percentages have reversed, with an average difference of 4.75%. Only one group has been studied six years after entering; in the entering class of 1960, more men than women had completed their degrees by 1966, and the difference in percentages was 7.9%. Generalizations about attrition after six years or more must await further information. (See Table 14.)

The absolute numbers of men and women in each undergraduate class appear, when graphed, to show higher attrition proportions for women than these percentages demonstrate. This is in large part due to the fact that 75% of community college transfers are men.

Official attrition data has not been compiled on any class since that graduating in 1966; unofficially, however, it is interesting to note that women constituted 38% of the senior class in 1970 (2,071 to 3,324) but earned 41% of the Bachelor's degrees for that class (2,023 to 2,977).

Attrition figures for the Law School are complicated by the fact that some students accelerated their programs rather than dropping out; since these are not shown in graduating vs. entering figures, the Law School has suggested no figures be printed. An official in the Medical School reported that attrition data there is not broken down by sex, that patterns are complicated by transfers, early graduations, and some slower programs. In addition, attrition rates in the Medical School are so low as not to be valid statistically. In the opinion of the spokesperson, women do as well as men.

The Graduate School has not compiled attrition data, but it supplied a list of students "Not Registered or On Leave" as of Spring 1970. As with undergraduates, the difference between men and women is small. (See Table 15.)

TABLE 11

UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS WHO ENTERED BY GPA AND LAST SCHOOL ATTENDED
FRESHMEN–AUTUMN QUARTER 1970

LAST SCHOOL ATTENDED % Below 2.0	NOT AVAIL.		LESS THAN 2.00		2.00-2.24		2.25-2.49		2.50-2.74		2.75-2.99		3.00-3.24		3.25-3.49		3.50-3.74		3.75-4.00		AVER.	% ABOVE 3.0	% ABOVE 3.5
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%			
HIGH SCHOOL																							
WOMEN	15	.9	16	1.0	18	1.1	14	.9	144	8.9	248	15.3	303	18.7	319	19.7	306	18.9	234	14.5	3.26	72	33
MEN	17	.9	37	2.0	31	1.7	27	1.5	261	14.1	313	16.9	365	19.7	351	18.9	297	16.0	158	8.5	3.11	63	25
JR. COLLEGE																							
WOMEN	5	6.7	5	6.7	5	6.7	7	9.3	7	9.3	11	14.7	20	26.7	7	9.3	3	4.0	5	6.7	2.77	47	11
MEN	14	11.6	21	17.4	14	11.6	6	5.0	15	12.4	12	9.9	15	12.4	10	8.3	7	5.8	7	5.8	2.71	32	12
COLLEGE																							
WOMEN	5	5.1	2	2.0	10	10.2	9	9.2	15	15.3	13	13.3	20	20.4	13	13.3	6	6.1	5	5.1	2.90	45	11
MEN	6	5.5	13	11.9	7	6.4	13	11.9	13	11.9	17	15.6	19	17.4	9	8.3	7	6.4	5	4.6	2.77	37	11
TOTAL																							
WOMEN	25	1.4	23	1.3	33	1.8	30	1.7	166	9.3	272	15.2	343	19.2	339	18.9	315	17.6	244	13.6	3.22	69	31
MEN	37	1.8	71	3.4	52	2.5	46	2.2	289	13.8	342	16.4	399	19.1	370	17.7	311	14.9	170	8.1	3.10	60	23
SOPHOMORES, JUNIORS, SENIORS																							
HIGH SCHOOL																							
WOMEN	1	50.0			1	50.0																	
MEN									1	100.0													
JR. COLLEGE																							
WOMEN	3	1.1	6	2.1	25	8.8	33	11.6	38	13.4	47	16.5	50	17.6	33	11.6	36	12.7	13	4.6	2.93	47	17
MEN	7	1.0	21	3.0	115	16.6	133	19.2	145	20.9	95	13.7	92	13.3	41	5.9	33	4.8	11	1.6	2.67	26	6
COLLEGE																							
WOMEN	11	3.3	5	1.5	22	6.6	38	11.3	64	19.1	51	15.2	55	16.4	41	12.2	35	10.4	13	3.9	2.92	43	14
MEN	9	3.0	11	3.7	42	14.0	43	14.3	53	17.7	34	11.3	49	16.3	31	10.3	20	6.7	8	2.7	2.77	36	9
TOTAL																							
WOMEN	15	2.4	11	1.8	48	7.7	71	11.4	102	16.4	98	15.8	105	16.9	74	11.9	71	11.4	26	4.2	2.93	44	16
MEN	16	1.6	32	3.2	157	15.8	176	17.7	199	20.0	129	13.0	141	14.2	72	7.2	53	5.3	19	1.9	2.71	29	7

Source: *New Student Report* Autumn 1970.

TABLE 12

SOURCE: REGISTRAR'S OFFICE

a. Annual Undergraduate Honors

	honors recipients				undergraduate students			
	M	%	W	%	M	%	W	%
1967-68	786	53	706	47	13,405	56	10,578	44
1968-69	885	52	820	48	14,768	56	11,466	44
1969-70	1,044	55	830	45	15,346	57	11,472	43

b. Quarterly High Scholarship 1969-70

	honors recipients				undergraduate students			
	M	%	W	%	M	%	W	%
Autumn	1,386	55	1,116	45	13,551	57	10,067	43
Winter	1,530	56	1,200	44	13,341	58	9,704	42
Spring	1,238	55	858	45	12,891	58	9,360	42

c. Certificates for High Scholarship

	honors recipients				undergraduate students			
	M	%	W	%	M	%	W	%
1967-68	100	51	94	49	13,405	56	10,578	44
1968-69	131	58	93	42	14,768	56	11,466	44
1969-70	188	52	171	48	15,346	57	11,472	43

d. Honors at Graduation–1969-70 (Source: Graduations Office)[9]

	honors recipients				undergraduate students			
	M	%	W	%	M	%	W	%
Summa	9	64	5	36	2,977	60	2,023	40
Magna	90	56	71	44				
Cum	153	46	172	54				
TOTAL	252	50	248	50				

[9]Numbers of honors recipients from *Program of Exercises, Ninety-Fifth Commencement (Revised)*; numbers of students graduating in 1970 from Annual Report to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, received from Graduations Office August 19, 1970.

TABLE 13

SOURCE: GRADUATE SCHOOL

a. Low Scholarship Notices 1969-70

	M	W	%W
Autumn	327	95	22
Winter	330	88	21
Spring	244	48	16
TOTAL	901	231	20

b. Total cases in which action was taken: 398

	No.	Ave. GPA	%
Women	90	2.63	22
Men	310	2.58	78

c. Action Taken: (percent of women in Graduate School: 32)

	W	%W	M	%M	T	%/T W	%/T M
Warn	51	57	208	67	259	20	80
Prob.	27	30	71	23	98	28	72
F/P	9	10	23	7	122	29	71
Drop	3	3	8	3	11	27	73
T:	90		310				

TABLE 14

Class entering:	% w/B.A. after 4 yrs.	after 5 yrs.	after 6 yrs.
Fall 1960	M 20.5 W 26.1	M 39 W 35.6	M 45.7 W 37.8
Fall 1961	M 22.4 W 31.6	M 46.8 W 40.7	
Fall 1962	M 25.3 W 28.6		

Median quarters to graduation:

M 14	M 17
M 13	W 16

TABLE 15

NOT REGISTERED OR ON LEAVE

	No.	% of Grad School	% of List
Women	259	32	35
Men	474	68	65

Of the students on the list, 39% were married; of these, 71% (209) were men, 29% (84) were women. Of the men on the list, 32% were married, and 44% of the women on the list were married. As a reason for withdrawal, marital status does not appear to be a significant variable. Incomplete as these data are, they warn against the easy conclusion that marriage is a significantly more important factor in affecting the academic progress of a woman than of a man. While factors operating in individual cases are often complex, it is clear that women as a group should be taken as seriously as men and that financial aid and other forms of encouragement should be equally forthcoming.

B. Attitudes Bearing on Attrition: Self-Fulfilling Prophesy

"I know you're competent and your thesis advisor knows you're competent. The question in our minds is are you *really serious* about what you're doing?"

"You really shouldn't worry. If you don't finish your thesis you'll already have done more than anyone expects you to do."

"The admissions committee didn't do their job. There is not one good-looking girl in the entering class."

"Have you ever thought about journalism? (to a student planning to get a PhD in political science) I know a lot of women journalists who do very well."

"No pretty girls ever come talk to me."

"I don't know why I bother to go into this for you–you're just going to get married anyway." (teacher complaining to student questioner in class)

"A pretty girl like you will certainly get married; why don't you stop with an MA?"

Professor to student looking for a job: "You've no business looking for work with a child that age."

Advisor to returning woman student: "You can go ahead and apply for graduate school if you want to, but I must warn you that women are not readily accepted in the area you are interested in, and your age is against you too."

"We expect women who come here to be competent, good students, but we don't expect them to be brilliant or original."

"Girls get good grades because they work hard, not because they're good thinkers."

"Women are intrinsically inferior."

"There are already too many women in this department."

"How old are you, anyway? Do you think that a girl like you could handle a job like this? You don't look like the academic type."

"Why don't you find a rich husband and give all this up?"

To a young divorcee with a five-year-old child who needed a fellowship to continue at graduate school: "You're very attractive. You'll get married again. We have to give fellowships to people who really need them."

"Somehow I can never take women in this field seriously."

That women's attrition rates at the University of Washington are similar to men's is a tribute to determination in the face of obstacles. Once they are admitted, women undergraduate or graduate students may find that professors and counselors have different expectations about their performance than they do about the performance of male students. These expectations are based not on individual ability but upon membership in a category, upon the fact that they are women. Remarks such as the ones quoted above can hardly be taken as encouragement; they indicate that women are expected to be decorative objects, that they are not likely to finish degrees (especially advanced degrees), or if they do they are somehow

"abnormal." They indicate the expectation that single women will marry and drop out, married women will have children and drop out, or that they ought to drop out.

Expectations have a substantial effect on performance. Recent research in educational psychology has shown that when teachers expected certain randomly selected students to "bloom" during the year, those students' IQs increased significantly above the IQs of a control group. Researchers Rosenthal and Jacobson also discovered that the expectation of experimenters made significant differences in the performance of subjects; even when textually identical instructions were read to the groups and teachers or experimenters were not aware of treating one group differently, they were actually giving both verbal and nonverbal cues about what was to be the appropriate response.[10]

Ann Sutherland Harris spoke to this before a House Subcommittee:

> If male scholars believe that women are intellectually inferior to men–less likely to have original contributions to make, less likely to be logical, and so on–will they not also find in the work of the women students in their classes the evidence to support their beliefs . . . ?
>
> . . . Rosenthal and Jacobson's experiments are extremely important to all scholars of human subjectivity and prejudice, for they show that it works both ways. Not only will those people who believe a certain human being . . . to be less intelligent innately find the evidence to support that belief in the behavior of the human being . . . but they will respond to human beings that they believe are good or intelligent in different ways from those they use when responding to human beings that they believe are bad or less intelligent. Their behavior will be subconscious. Indeed, they will firmly believe that their judgment is rational and objective.[11]

The study prepared by the University of Chicago's Committee on University Women confirmed in a quantitative, empirical way what individual women have known from experience: that women receive significantly less perceived support for career plans than men do, that a large number of women had suffered or had heard of discriminatory practices against women, and that most women students felt that men were often preferred by the faculty.[12]

"You're too strong for a woman."

Math professor to female graduate student: "Women shouldn't go into math; it's too masculine."

"Any woman who has got this far has got to be a kook."

Another barrier to a woman's academic achievement is what psychologist Matina Horner has isolated as the "motive to avoid success." Faced with the conventional Freudian belief that competitive, aggressive behavior is not feminine, a woman may consciously or unconsciously equate intellectual achievement with loss of femininity and her own achievement motivation will be inhibited by fears of social rejection, doubts about normality, or defensive denials that women are capable of success. "A bright woman is caught in a double bind."

> In testing and other achievement-oriented situations she worried not only about failure, but also about success. If she fails, she is not living up to her own standards of performance; if she succeeds, she is not living up to societal expectations about the female role. Men in our society do not experience this kind of ambivalence, because they are not only permitted but actively encouraged to do well.[13]

Given equal or even lesser abilities, a man has a better chance at success because he knows that society will reward him, whereas a woman feels it will punish her.

C. Role Models and Counseling

Women comprise only 13.7% of the basic teaching faculty at the University of Washington; it is possible for a student to complete four years of academic work without ever having taken a course taught by a woman. The paucity of women on the faculty, especially in areas where large numbers of women study,[14] creates a lack of what sociologists refer to as "visible

[10] R. Rosenthal and L. Jacobson, *Pygmalion in the Classroom: Teacher Expectation and Pupil's Intellectual Development*, New York, 1968.

[11] *Testimony Before the Special House Subcommittee on Education With Respect to Section 805 of HR 16098*, June 16, 1970, page 8.

[12] *Women in the University of Chicago: Report of the Committee on University Women*, May 1, 1970, pp. 43-46, 89-112.

[13] "A Bright Woman is Caught in a Double Bind," *Psychology Today*, November 1969, pp. 36-38, 62. Horner's research included test-anxiety scores, Thematic Apperception Tests (TAT), and reactions to competitive situations.

[14] Departments in which over 33% of the graduate students are women but under 20% of the faculty is female are: Anthropology 14%, Art 14%, Asian L&L 11%, Botany 0%, Classics 0%, Communications 5%, English 10%, Far Eastern 0%, German L&L 19%, History 5%, Music 19%, Near Eastern 7%, Psychology 11%, Romance L&L 19%, Scandinavian L&L 0%, Sociology 0%, Zoology 17%. All figures are according to the Provosts' List, Autumn Quarter 1969.

life models." Women at UW do not see enough successful women, women in high ranks, or even women treated as equals by their male colleagues to experience support for their own endeavors, or to believe that fields other than traditional women's fields are open to them. They may also find that, in order to succeed in a professional career, a woman must be not only as good, but better than a man. The limited number of women on the graduate faculties acclimatizes women students to their professional expectations: low rank, low status, a slower rate of promotion than their male colleagues, and a more difficult tenure hurdle.

In addition, small numbers of women on the faculty mean few women among the program advisors, especially for graduate students:

TABLE 16

Advisors = 71 men, 6 women = 7.79%
Alternates = 65 men, 7 women = 9.72%
TOTAL = 136 men, 13 women = 8.73%

Minus Home Economics, Women's Physical Education, and Nursing, the percentage of female advisors is lower:

TABLE 17

Advisors = 71 men, 3 women = 4.05%
Alternates = 65 men, 4 women = 5.87%
TOTAL = 136 men, 7 women = 4.89%[15]

As David Riesman concludes,

> Even very gifted and creative young women are satisfied to assume that on graduation they will get underpaid ancillary positions ... where they are seldom likely to advance to real opportunity. A certain throttling down occurs, therefore, both in college and later on, which then, in the usual vicious circle, allows men so mindful to depreciate women as incapable of the higher achievement.[16]

Women at the University of Washington are accused overtly or covertly of lack of seriousness, of being intellectually inferior. As a result, many women are more anxious than men students about their work and future. It is not surprising that some women decide they are inadequate; rather, considering the lack of encouragement and the actual discouragement experienced by women students, it is surprising that their attrition rates are not higher.

V. FINANCIAL AIDS

A. Grants, Loans, and Scholarships[17]

1. Distribution of Awards

The primary criterion used by the Office of Financial Aids in awarding grants, loans and scholarships, is that of financial need. Financial need can be established in a fairly objective way, and is, therefore, less subject to bias in the distribution process. It is interesting to note in Table 18, however, that while women receive 47% of all awards in this area, they receive only 45.4% of the total monetary allocation. By contrast, men receive 53% of all awards, and 54.6% of the total allocation. This means that the average amount awarded to males is slightly greater than the amount awarded to females.

Table 18 illustrates the number and amount of grants, loans and scholarships awarded during 1969-70. Awards were made to 2,034 women, (16% of all women enrolled), while the number granted to men was 2,290, or 11% of all those enrolled. This would seem to indicate a greater incidence of need on the part of women, a situation which may result in part from the fact that women receive a lower percentage of the other forms of financial assistance.

[15] *Graduate Study and Research Bulletin 1969.*

[16] Quoted in Kathleen Shortridge, "Woman as University Nigger," *The Daily Magazine*, University of Michigan, April 12, 1970, p. 21.

[17] Includes only those scholarships and loans which are administered directly through the Office of Financial Aid.

TABLE 18

AMOUNT AND NUMBER OF AWARDS BY SEX[18]

GRANTS, LOANS, AND SCHOLARSHIPS

	MEN		WOMEN	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Institutional Scholarships	300	95,113	300	98,809
Health Professions Scholarships–Dentistry	97	62,150	---	---
Health Professions Scholarships–Pharmacy	30	21,000	20	12,577
Nursing Scholarships			49	19,121
Educational Opportunity Grants	533	265,073	453	218,757
National Defense Student Loans	1,271	770,500	1,122	646,300
Nursing Student Loans	---	---	90	60,700
Health Professions Loans–Dentistry	59	76,292	---	---
TOTAL	2,290	1,271,228	2,034	1,056,264
% Total Recipients and Amount Awarded	53%	54.6%	47%	45.4%

2. **Financial Aids Policy Change**

During the Summer of 1970, it was brought to the attention of the Women's Commission that a policy existed in the Financial Aids Department whereby application for financial assistance was restricted to only one member of a family unit. Since only the husband *or* the wife could then apply, and since society places a higher value upon male education than upon female education, this generally meant that if a choice was to be made within a family unit between the husband or the wife attending college (where money was available for only one), the wife's education was usually postponed or abandoned entirely in favor of the husband. While it is true that in some cases the wife was the one to apply and subsequently to receive the financial aid award, the reverse situation occurred most often.

The policy was discussed with financial aids administrators who agreed to remove the restriction and allow each individual, whether married or not, to apply as an individual, and on the basis of individual need. A revised policy is presently in effect.

B. Scholarships, Fellowships, and Traineeships

Table 19 shows the number of scholarships, fellowships, and traineeships which were awarded for academic year 1969-70, and the percentage received by women. The figures in Table 19 include only those scholarships, fellowships and traineeships which are administered through the Graduate School, and the nominations for which are submitted by the various departments. For those awards designated as "Type A," money is allocated to the department, then the department decides who will receive the award. Type B indicates those awards for which there is individual competition with some department pre-screening or approval influence. Individual competition-type awards where students apply independently and directly to an outside agency are omitted here (NSF, Woodrow Wilson Fellowships, Woodrow Wilson Dissertation Fellowships, Public Health Service, HUD, Fulbright-Hays, AFGRAD, Sarah Denny and AEC Fellowships).

[18]Figures contained in Table 18 were obtained from the Office of Financial Aids.

TABLE 19

SCHOLARSHIPS, FELLOWSHIPS, AND TRAINEESHIPS

TYPE "A"	Women	Men	% Women
National Science Foundation Traineeship	12	75	14
National Science Foundation Summer Traineeship or TA's	0	11	0
NDEA Title IV	45	147	23
NDEA Title VI Fellowships	12	38	24
NDEA Title VI Summer Intensive Fellowships	26	34	43
EPDA V Fellowships	1	9	10
AEC Traineeships	0	1	0
NASA Traineeships	0	10	0
Graduate School RA's	10	17	37
Graduate School Fellowships	0	2	0
	(106)	(344)	(21%)
TYPE "B"			
Social Rehabilitation (Child) Traineeship	3	2	60
Social Rehabilitation (Adult) Traineeship	3	7	30
USOE Audio-Speech Fellowship	6	2	75
American Foundation for Pharm. Educ. Fellowships	1	2	33
U.S. Steel Found. Fellowships	0	1	0
Bureau of Commercial Fisheries Fellowship	0	1	0
IBM Fellowship	0	1	0
TOTALS	119	360	25%

C. Subfaculty Positions

It is not entirely clear how the various departments go about selecting candidates for their subfaculty positions–whether selections are made on the basis of experience and other objective criteria such as GPA which could be together termed as "qualifications"; whether such positions are used as a kind of bribe to attract certain graduate students; or whether they are used as a means of providing financial assistance to students on the basis of need. It is clear, however, that to those graduate students who have little or no other means of support, subfaculty positions are, in effect, a form of financial aid.

To many women graduate students, the question of financial assistance–or subsidy–is very crucial, and in some departments the issue of subsidy has been used in such a way as to prevent women students from entering. Cases have been reported wherein a department will not grant admission to a woman until she has secured financial support, and then will not grant financial support until she has been accepted. Under the present system where each department has autonomous power in the processing of scholarships, fellowships, traineeships and subfaculty positions, it is not unlikely that such situations could occur.

Table 20 documents the number of women and men holding subfaculty positions, and the salary for each within each category. As can be seen, women receive only 25.4% of departmental subsidy in the form of subfaculty positions.

TABLE 20

	MEN		WOMEN		
	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	% Women of Total
Lecturer (Post-Doc)	$937	24	$1,026	3	11.11
Instructor (Post-Doc)	952	17	908	3	15.00
Associate	845	28	838	23	45.09
Teaching Assoc. II	850	52	850	8	13.33
Teaching Assoc. I	780	142	780	43	23.24
Teaching Asst.	720	540	720	212	28.19
Staff Assoc.	720	2	------	------	0
Clin. Assoc.	655	65	703	23	26.13
Staff Asst.	670	1	670	2	67.00
Research Asst.	670	5	670	4	44.44
Grad. Student Asst.	670	4	------	------	0
Language Asst.	516	2	660	4	67.00
Research Assoc.	985	4	638	1	20.00
Student Asst.	600	9	600	6	40.00
Clin. Asst.	575	136	570	18	11.68
Intern	542	3	375	2	40.00
		1,034		352	25.40%

With regard to salaries, there is not the glaring differential in pay for women and men in the same ranks in the subfaculty positions as exists within the permanent faculty (see Part I of this Report). In fact, in some categories women have a higher average salary than men. Yet overall, women earn slightly less than men. Table 21 shows that the highest concentration of women is in the salary range of from $700 to $800 (78.97%), as compared with 66.15% of the men; and while 12.08% men receive salaries in excess of $800, only 10.50% of the women do so.[19]

TABLE 21

SALARY RANGE	No.	% of Men	% Men of Total	No.	% of Women	% Women of Total
900 & Above	45	4.35	88.24	6	1.70	11.76
800 – 900	80	7.73	72.08	31	8.80	27.92
700 – 800	684	66.15	71.11	278	78.97	28.89
600 – 700	84	8.12	79.76	17	4.82	20.24
500 – 600	141	13.63	88.68	18	5.11	11.32
400 – 500	0	0	0	0	0	0
300 – 400	0	0	0	2	5.68	100.00
	1,034			352		

D. Work Study

Work study jobs are coordinated through the Financial Aids Office and the Student Employment Office. They are subsidized in part by the employer (which is sometimes the University and sometimes an outside agency), and in part by the federal government, and are normally part of a financial aids package. By accepting a work study job, the student can then make up the deficit between the amount received from other forms of financial aid and the amount needed to attend the University.

A brief survey of work study jobs showed that men earned 19 cents more per hour than women in 1969, and 21 cents per hour more in 1970 (see Table 22). From the data available, it is impossible to determine the source of the wage difference, though there are two possible explanations: (1) Wage differentials within the same job categories, and (2) the existence of a large number of jobs which are usually filled by men ("men's work") and which usually pay more. Research conducted into other areas of student employment would seem to indicate that the latter explanation is applicable in the case of work study jobs.

[19]Note that all salary figures are controlled for 100% time.

The problem of job definition–that is, where certain work has traditionally been considered "men's work" or "women's work"–is basic to sex discrimination in employment. The employer helps to perpetuate these definitions being reluctant to hire, or outright refusing to hire, one or the other sex for a particular job. Thus in the case of work study jobs, the responsibility for wage equity rests in part with the Office of Financial Aids, and in part with the employer. But since it is the Office of Financial Aids which has contact with students, and which accepts employers for the work study program, we of the University must look to that office to refuse to accept employers who perpetuate unfair labor practices and who discriminate on the basis of sex or race.

TABLE 22

	Number	Year	Gross Earnings[20]	Average Hourly Rate
WOMEN	334	1969	$108,879	$2.26
MEN	271	1969	96,243	2.45
WOMEN	177	1970	20,177	2.22
MEN	200	1970	24,157	2.43

E. Student Employment

1. Employment Distribution

There are three major job sources to which University of Washington students have access. Those are:

a. **Student Helper and Assistant Jobs**: These are available in various departments and units of the University. Anyone holding such a job is employed by the University and the money from which salaries are paid comes directly from the University's operating budget. Subfaculty jobs are also available at the University, and are considered in Subsection C above.

b. **Work Study Jobs**: These jobs are usually included as part of a financial aid package, and are subsidized partially by the federal government and partially by the employer. See Subsection D above.

c. **Outside Employment**: Jobs may also be secured with local agencies. Such employment is independent of the University, except that referral service and continuous job listings are made available through the Student Employment Office in Schmitz Hall. This service is fully discussed in Subsection E to follow.

In Part I of this Report, an attempt was made to determine the opportunity available to women in the faculty and staff areas of employment at the University as compared with those of men. Similarly, a study was made to determine the opportunity available to women students within the overall area of student employment. Several problems were discovered in all three of the major job source areas indicated above and are discussed in the pertinent subsections. Particular attention will be directed here toward the Student Helper and Assistant categories.

According to the University's Student Employee Pay Schedule and Classification Guideline, dated September 24, 1970, both the Student Helper and the Student Assistant categories are broken down into five grades. Each grade includes certain types of jobs, the placement of which is determined by the presumed "degree of work difficulty and responsibility." A specified hourly wage rate is assigned to each grade, the lowest rate being $1.70 per hour in grade I, and the highest rate being $3.40 in grade V. The range of pay within each group is 20 cents, except for grade V.

Research was conducted, using job referral sheets which reflect the number of student employees and the positions held as of Fall Quarter, 1970. This information was obtained through the Student Employment Office.

Table 23 shows distribution of women and men over the five salary grades within the Student Helper and Assistant categories, as well as the average hourly salary received. Unlike the situation in Staff Employment where substantial salary differentials exist (see Part I of this Report), the average pay for men and women in the Student Helper and Assistant categories is quite consistent, except in grade IV, where men earn an average of 15 cents per hour more than women. This would not be significant were it not that the total range for that grade amounts to only 20 cents.

The most significant information indicated by Table 23 is the distribution of women over the five grades. It can be seen that women are concentrated in grade I (58%), having an average hourly pay rate of $1.73, while only 38% of the men employed are in that grade. And while 15% of all male students employed are found in grade V (which has a salary range of $2.50 to $3.40) only 8% of the female students employed are to be found in that grade.

[20]Figures contained in Table 22 were obtained from the Office of Financial Aids. Note: Total number of men on the work study program for fiscal year 1969-70 was 615. Total number of women for fiscal year 1969-70 was 552.

TABLE 23

Grade	Salary Range	WOMEN No. Employed	WOMEN % Total Employed	WOMEN Average $ Per Hour	MEN No. Employed	MEN % Total Employed	MEN Average $ Per Hour
I	170 – 190	905	58	1.73	691	38	1.73
II	190 – 210	365	24	1.95	513	29	1.95
III	2.10–2.30	97	06	2.13	189	11	2.11
IV	2.30–2.50	57	04	2.21	129	07	2.36
V	2.50–3.40	129	08	2.83	275	15	2.81
	TOTAL	1,553			1,797		

This distribution pattern is in keeping with the general pattern of employment here in the University and in the nation as a whole. Throughout, women tend to be concentrated in the lower paying, menial jobs—and for women students in grade I, this is more than a generalization. To illustrate, following are examples of the type of jobs included in grade I: Bus boy/girl, kitchen helper, usher, ticket taker, dishwasher, and library page.

2. **Library Page Jobs**

This category of student employment is deserving of particular attention, for it is an area where several serious problems exist.

In the Summer of 1970, the Library Page category as then listed on the Student Employee Pay Schedule was rated under grade I, with a starting salary of $1.60 per hour (the state minimum wage at the time). The distinguishing factor of grade I, according to the Schedule, is that "no previous knowledge or experience" is required.[21] There are approximately 250 library page positions in the library, more than half of which are filled by women.[22]

The attention of the Women's Commission was drawn to this area when investigations into student employment showed that there were several areas which hired predominantly males or females. For example, the areas of grounds maintenance, custodial, and parking hired men exclusively, and the library hired women predominantly. Contact with supervisors in all four areas showed that students were hired who had no "previous knowledge or experience," and that the grounds maintenance, custodial, and parking jobs were rated as grade II, and being paid a starting salary of $2.20 which was actually grade III scale. The Library Page jobs, however, were being paid a starting salary of $1.60.

At the time this discovery was made, the Women's Commission recommended that the Library Page job be reclassified as grade II. This recommendation was rejected by the administration.

It was later brought to our attention that—simultaneous with our investigations—students employed in the library were also attempting to have the Library Page category reclassified as grade II. Their argument was based on the fact that the Library Page category had been classified as grade II until 1966, and in that year had been reclassified as grade I. This reclassification had come about not as the result of a change in duties or responsibilities, but rather as the result of an economic "crisis" in the library. In 1966 the minimum wage for the state of Washington was raised to $1.40 per hour, which meant a 5-cent increase for all library student employees. In order to absorb the cost of an across-the-board minimum wage increase, the library decided to lower the classification of the Library Page jobs. Documents from the period prove that this change was viewed as temporary in nature, and that it was expected that the grade II classification would be reinstated. Such a reinstatement has not occurred.[23]

3. **Redress of Grievance**

Discrimination on the basis of sex is illegal, and there are now several ways in which any woman who has experienced such discrimination may take action against an offending employer, whether on the University of Washington Campus or elsewhere. Following is a list of federal and state agencies which handle sex discrimination complaints, and a brief description of their authority and jurisiction.

[21] It should be noted here that the "experience" requirement has come under severe question in cases where women have been previously excluded from a particular job and could, therefore, never have gained such experience. Additionally the "experience" requirement—by admission of the University administration—is somewhat arbitrary and is used on the Student Pay Schedule merely as an indicator, or a guide, and is not meant to be absolute.

[22] The library student employee count as of April 1970 was 147 women, 132 men: Total—279. Information obtained from Library Personnel Office.

[23] At the present time, the library administration agrees that the Library Page jobs should be classified as Grade II, but until recently were unable to secure the concurrence of Personnel Services. Permission for reclassification has now been granted, but no funds have been allocated for that purpose.

WASHINGTON STATE BOARD AGAINST DISCRIMINATION: In May, 1971, as this report was being prepared, the State Legislature passed House Bill 594, which amended the Washington State Law against Discrimination (RCW 49.60.120) to include sex. Amendments were made only to those sections dealing with employment (public accommodations and newspaper classified ads are specifically excluded). With this new revision, any woman in the state of Washington may file a complaint with the State Board Against Discrimination against any employer, union, or employment agency which practices discrimination on the basis of sex.

CONTRACT COMPLIANCE: Any agency or institution which receives grants or contracts from the federal government in excess of $50,000 is subject to Contract Compliance guidelines which (by reason of Executive Order 11246 as amended by 11375) prohibit discrimination on the basis of sex. In November 1970, a class action complaint was filed against the University of Washington by the Women's Commission. Regardless of this fact, individual women may at any time file a complaint against the University for specific discrimination encountered. Such complaints should be filed with the local branch of Health, Education, and Welfare's Office for Civil Rights.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION: This federal agency is responsible for administering Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, which includes a prohibition of discrimination on the basis of sex in employment. Certain conditions are imposed under Title VII: Only employers employing over 25 persons, or unions or employment agencies serving over 25 persons are covered, and federal employees and state employees are specifically excluded. Complaints may be filed with the EEOC which has a district office in Seattle. Jurisdiction can be determined at the time a complaint is filed.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD: Employed women or minorities who are members of a union, and who experience discrimination in their conditions of employment by virtue of the union's contractual agreement with the employer may file a complaint with the NLRB (which has comparatively strong enforcement powers). University employees are exempt from NLRB jurisdiction. Specifically (and unfortunately) all employees of the following types are exempt: Agricultural laborers, domestic servants, any individual employed by her parent or spouse, independent contractors, supervisors, individuals employed by an employer subject to the Railway Labor Act, Government employees, including those employed by the U.S. Government, any Government corporation or Federal Reserve Bank, or any State or political subdivision such as a city, town, or school district.

WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION – DEPARTMENT OF LABOR: This division administers the Equal Pay portion of the Fair Labor Standards Act, and has jurisdiction in instances where women are being paid less than other employees who perform substantially the same work. The word "substantially" is important for it is often the case that job titles or codes may be different but the work performed very similar. Similarity in jobs is determined by factors of skill, effort, and responsibility (mental effort can be equated to physical effort). Information pertinent to filing under this act may be obtained from the Seattle branch of the Wage and Hour Division.

HIGHER EDUCATION PERSONNEL BOARD: The Higher Education Personnel Board, with offices in Olympia is the state agency charged with providing overall policy direction to all aspects of classified staff personnel administration at the state's four-year institutions of higher education and the community colleges. The Board has adopted a variety of rules which are administered on each campus through each school's staff personnel office. These rules cover all aspects of such matters as appointments, reclassifications, salary administration, disciplinary actions, separations including terminations for cause, and layoffs.

In the event a classified staff member feels aggrieved concerning a decision in any of the matters covered by the Board's rules, such a grievance should be referred to the campus director of staff personnel for review and possible resolution.

However, inasmuch as all personnel actions may be ultimately appealed to the Higher Education Personnel Board, individuals should be aware of their legal opportunity to file an appeal with the Board for an additional review, the results of which are binding upon the school.

F. Student Employment Office

Next to employment with the University as Student Helpers and Assistants, the largest number of jobs held by students are those located in the surrounding community. These outside jobs are obtained through listings which are administered by the Student Employment Office. During the 1969-70 academic year, the Student Employment Office listed 2,900 jobs, of which 2,350 were filled. This compares with 3,450 Student Helper and Assistant jobs, and 1,167 Work Study.

Until the Spring of 1970, it had been the practice of the Student Employment Office to list jobs separately for women and men, in accordance with the wishes of the employer. Such practice was in violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as interpreted by the EEOC, and to which the University is subject by virtue of its obligations under Federal Contract Compliance regulations. This change was made voluntarily by Student Employment administrators, with some urging from the Women's Commission. Under the new procedure, the Student Employment Office will no longer list jobs for employers who specify one or the other sex.

After the change was made, the Commission prepared a handout which details action to be taken by students against employers who practice discrimination on the basis of sex. This information is presently made available to every student who uses the Student Employment facilities.

A similar change was instituted in the University *Daily*, whose advertising department had listed help wanted ads in segregated "male," "female" columns. This function of a newspaper is considered by the EEOC to be the same as that of an employment agency, and is therefore subject to Title VII.

G. Student Housing

In May of 1971, a new Student Housing Policy will officially be in operation. Under the old policy, married student housing and single student housing was available only to graduate students. Within that category, priorities were granted to those graduate students having TA's or RA's. Investigations showed that according to the policy a married female graduate student could not apply for married student housing if her husband were not a student. It was possible, of course, for a married male graduate student whose wife was not a student to make application. This procedure (which was based on the assumption that married women are "kept" women) was changed early in 1970, with some urging from the Women's Commission.

While involved in the change described above, the Women's Commission came to believe that student housing should be open to all students, and should be considered a form of financial aid. This belief was based on the fact that student housing, which is owned and operated by the University, is low in cost when compared with surrounding housing. Thus when a student is accepted into student housing, her or his income is, in effect, being subsidized by the University.

The Women's Commission helped in designing the new policy which will soon go into effect. We supported the idea of eligibility based on income, and argued for low income brackets which would reflect the income of the most needy students. We also supported a three-point priority system which allowed for first priority to students enrolled through the EOP program, a second priority for single women with children, and a third for any student with a special need.

VI. CONCLUSION

In view of the findings indicated in this Report, and in order to take affirmative action to correct the inequities which exist and to broaden the opportunities for women students at the University of Washington, the Women's Commission makes the following recommendations.

In an effort to counteract the effects of channeling, it is recommended that an extensive recruiting program be instituted which would seek out and actively encourage women to enter scientific and professional fields and all areas of study in which they are presently under-represented.

It is recommended that the professional schools, the Graduate School, and the various graduate departments strive for a sex balance, and that they not turn down qualified women until such balance is reached. In areas where women predominate, such as the School of Social Work or Nursing, efforts should eventually be made to recruit men. This should not be done, however, until it is clear that all departments are sincerely striving for a sex balance, for it is often the case that, in the name of sex equality, men are recruited into traditionally "women's fields" where a simultaneous effort is not made in male dominated fields to provide openings for women.

It is recommended that all departments be required to conduct a review of their curriculum in order to isolate and eliminate those attitudes and dogmas which perpetuate a patriarchal bias and which teach the inherent inferiority of women.

It is recommended that steps be taken to assure that women have the opportunity to compete for subfaculty positions and all forms of financial aid on an equal basis with men, and as an affirmative action step, it is urged that in departments or areas of study where few women are enrolled, particular emphasis be placed on assuring that women students receive the amount of financial subsidy necessary for the continuation of their study.

In the area of student employment it is recommended that vigorous steps be taken to identify those areas which have favored the hiring of men, and that such areas be required to begin active recruitment of women.